

## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 374 878

JC 940 582

AUTHOR Walters, Judy E.  
TITLE Registration Priorities: A Report.  
INSTITUTION California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Office of the Chancellor.  
PUB DATE 8 Sep 94  
NOTE 52p.; Prepared as Agenda Item Number 16 for a Meeting of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges (Sacramento, CA, September 8, 1994).  
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)  
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.  
DESCRIPTORS \*Admission Criteria; College Admission; \*Community Colleges; \*Educational Practices; \*Enrollment Management; \*Retrenchment; School Holding Power; \*School Registration; State Surveys; Two Year Colleges; Use Studies  
IDENTIFIERS \*California Community Colleges

## ABSTRACT

In May 1993, the California Community Colleges' Board of Governors adopted systemwide guidelines recommending student registration priorities to help address current discrepancies between available resources and courses and the colleges' open-door mission. This report describes the guidelines and results of a study conducted to determine their implementation at the colleges, as well as other enrollment management (EM) initiatives in use. First, background on the guidelines indicates that due to funding reductions, the colleges have cut course sections by 10% since 1990 and have experienced a 9% decrease in headcount enrollment since 1990. Next, findings from the study of college practices are presented, including the following: (1) only 4 of the 107 community colleges in the state did not have formal registration priorities, while for the 103 with priorities, the most common criteria were continuing students, disabled/equal opportunity students, units completed, and matriculated students; (2) 28 of the colleges with priorities follow the Board's guidelines by designated students with baccalaureate degrees as the lowest priority, and (3) with respect to changes from 1992-93, matriculated and returning students, units completed, and grade point average increased most in use. Finally, information is provided on other EM practices in use, including adjustments to curricula, marketing, admissions/registration processes, retention strategies, pricing, and delivery methods. Appendixes provide the Board guidelines, the survey instrument, detailed survey results from 1992-93 and 1993-94 studies, and data on EM activities at the colleges. (KP)

\*\*\*\*\*  
\* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made \*  
\* from the original document. \*  
\*\*\*\*\*

## Registration Priorities: A Report

Judy E. Walters

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS  
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. El-Bdour

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES  
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
Office of Educational Research and Improvement  
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION  
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as  
received from the person or organization  
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve  
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-  
ment do not necessarily represent official  
OERI position or policy.

California Community Colleges, Sacramento  
Office of the Chancellor

## REGISTRATION PRIORITIES

16

### **A REPORT**

*Presentation: Judy E. Walters, Vice Chancellor  
Policy Analysis and Development*

### **Issue**

This item presents information on how the community colleges changed their registration priorities, following Board of Governors' adoption—in May 1993—of guidelines about such priorities. The item also describes how the colleges are using other measures to manage enrollments.

### **Background**

In May 1993, after nearly one year of work, the California Community Colleges' Board of Governors adopted systemwide guidelines recommending student registration priorities for use by the colleges. These guidelines provide a tool to help the colleges address the current discrepancy between available resources and the colleges' mission.

California Community Colleges continue the practice of "open door" admissions, providing access to all California high school graduates and those other adults who can profit from community college work. However, it has become apparent that since 1991, not all students are able to enroll in all the courses they desire because of budget cutbacks. Consequently, there is concern about which students are able to get their desired class schedules; i.e., about registration priorities and whether these priorities are consistent with the colleges' mission. The Board guidelines address this concern by providing colleges with help in managing their enrollments.

The guidelines had been developed by a Registration Priorities Task Force, broadly representative of the usual college constituencies, and had gone through the normal consultation process prior to Board of Governors' action.

While use of the guidelines is voluntary, the Board action was accompanied by a note that the Chancellor's Office would conduct a survey "... to determine the extent to which the registration priority guidelines have been considered and applied." This

report presents the results of that study and information on the use of other initiatives that enable districts to manage enrollment demand to fit within their available resources.

## Analysis

- Following adoption of Board of Governors' guidelines on registration priorities,
  - ▶ two of every three districts changed their priorities.
  - ▶ of those changing their priorities, 63 percent included reference to matriculation, a central feature of the Board's guidelines.
  - ▶ A frequent change in registration priorities, from 1992-93 to 1993-94, was to rank DSPS and EOPS students ahead of continuing students.
  - ▶ Only a few districts who made changes gave priority, among matriculated students, to recent high school graduates over other new students—as called for in the Board of Governors' guidelines. However, nearly one-third of the colleges are more actively recruiting high school graduates.
- The typical community college registration priority is:
  - DSPS and EOPS Students
  - Continuing Students (followed by other criteria in this order:)
  - Units Completed
  - Matriculated Students
  - Special Majors
  - Grade Point Average
  - Returning Students
- One-third of community colleges assign a lower registration priority to students with baccalaureate degrees (an issue central to both the Board of Governors' and legislative policy).
- Review of college enrollment management activities shows considerable recent activity by colleges in changing their curriculum, marketing, registration, and increasing their delivery of instruction off-campus; but, fewer changes in admissions, articulation, student follow-up, and financial aid processes.

- The combined impact of registration priorities and other conditions may have made access to community colleges difficult for older, part-time students who are new or returning. This is clearly true for those students who have baccalaureate degrees.

## Conclusion

Fiscal constraints since 1991 have prevented the community colleges from providing potential students with all the courses they desire. Board guidelines on registration priorities appear to be a useful reference for the community colleges as they go about deciding which students will have priority in the registration process and, thereby, will be more likely to obtain their desired classes.

*Staff: Chuck McIntyre, Director  
Research and Analysis*

# Registration Priorities

---

## Background

In May 1993, after nearly one year of work, the California Community Colleges' Board of Governors adopted systemwide guidelines recommending student registration priorities for use by the colleges (Appendix A). These guidelines are intended to provide a uniform tool to help the colleges address the current discrepancy between available resources and the colleges' mission. As stated in AB 1725 (1988), this mission is to provide access to quality programs in transfer and career education and in the mastery of basic skills and in English as a second language.

California Community Colleges continue the practice of "open door" admissions, providing access to all California high school graduates and those other adults who can profit from community college work. However, it has become apparent that since 1991, not all students are able to enroll in all the courses they desire because of budget cutbacks. Consequently, there is concern about which students are able to get their desired courses, i.e., about registration priorities and whether these priorities are consistent with the colleges' mission. The Board guidelines address this concern by providing colleges with help in managing their enrollments.

The guidelines had been developed by a Registration Priorities Task Force, broadly representative of the usual college constituencies, and had gone through the normal consultation process prior to Board of Governors' action.

While use of the guidelines is voluntary, the Board action was accompanied by a note that the Chancellor's Office would conduct a survey "... to determine the extent to which the registration priority guidelines have been considered and applied." This report presents the results of that study. (See survey instrument in Appendix B.)

This report also examines the use of a number of initiatives—beyond registration priorities—that enable districts to manage enrollment demand to fit within their available resources.

## Study Design

This report reviews the registration priorities used during 1993-94 by colleges and how they changed from the prior year, after adoption of the Board guidelines. To determine the extent of such change, we can compare this year's priorities with those used in 1992-93, as determined in an earlier survey. (Results of both surveys are displayed in Appendix C, while specific district priorities are displayed in Appendix D.) This review is followed by an analysis of other actions taken by the

colleges, such as changes to marketing, registration, and probation processes, which also impact college enrollment (Appendix E). First, however, it is useful to review the current context in which all these measures take place.

## **Context**

### **Legal Basis**

California community colleges must admit California residents who possess a high school diploma or the equivalent, and may admit (1) nonresidents, (2) those over 18 years old without high school equivalent, but capable of profiting from the instruction offered, and (3) K-12 students through special attendance.

There is no legal requirement that community colleges provide admitted students with all their program and course needs. Board regulation (Title 5, Section 58106) enables districts to limit enrollments based on:

- Required prerequisites
- Health and safety considerations
- Facility limitations
- Faculty workload
- The availability of qualified instructors
- Funding limitations
- Constraints of regional planning
- Other legal requirements

Local trustee boards may use a priority system for student enrollment (Title 5, Section 58108) and give priority or special assistance to EOPS (Title 5, Section 56232) and DSPS (Title 5, Section 56206) students. Colleges may not, however, use assessment or other evaluative selection techniques to determine who may enroll.

The Board guidelines do not supersede regulations. Regulations must be followed, guidelines may be followed. This distinction should be kept in mind as we examine the extent to which the registration priority guidelines have been considered and applied by college districts.

### **Funding and Programming**

Between 1985 and 1991, California community colleges experienced their longest sustained period of growth in two decades (Appendix F). This growth was the result of continuing high enrollment demand and adequate funding, particularly funding in

1989 and 1990 from AB 1725 (1988) for program improvement as well as cost-of-living adjustments (COLA) and student growth. Community college enrollment reached its all-time peak of 1,532,000 in the fall 1991.

Beginning with the 1991-92 budget year, however, funding for community colleges has been reduced (COLA and program improvement are no longer provided) and student enrollment fees were increased in 1992-93 and 1993-94. Consequently, despite continuing high enrollment demand—due to the recession, population growth, and actions by the University of California (UC) and the California State University (CSU) systems—the colleges have cut their course sections by ten percent since 1990 and are down 130,000 (nine percent) in headcount enrollment. (See Chancellor's Office reports on *Fee Impact* and *Course and Curriculum Change*.)

The characteristics of current student enrollments are the result of two factors: (1) the loss of baccalaureate students (who carried relatively light loads) in 1993 and (2) the several-year trend toward enrollment of students who are more often younger, full-time, and transfer-oriented than was the case prior to 1990.

The heaviest course cuts have been by colleges who began the decade with the fewest budget reserves; i.e., they had the least fiscal capability. Efforts by colleges to keep course offerings within their fiscal capability appear concentrated largely on the elimination of small classes, taken in many cases by older students. The largest course cuts have been in business and management, engineering and related disciplines, foreign languages, physical education, and fine and applied arts. Many course cuts were due to fee increases for students with baccalaureate degrees and their subsequent withdrawal in the spring 1993.

By contrast, the fewest cuts (and even some increases) in course offerings have occurred in mathematics, social sciences, and humanities (including English and English as a Second Language); all areas for which colleges have reported class waiting lists at the beginning of most recent terms.

Thus, this review of college registration priorities takes place against a backdrop where, since 1990, these colleges have reduced their curriculum and appear to have shifted the balance of their course offerings somewhat away from small courses toward larger, typically transfer and basic skills courses. This shift represents a reversal in the trend of the late 1980's when there was an observable increase in the proportion of older students enrolled for occupational purposes. (The proportion of students enrolled for basic skills has increased steadily over the past decade.)

The current shift—back toward transfer—is due in part to actions of UC and CSU, diverting students to community colleges, the emphasis of AB 1725 on transfer, and to the economic recession. Traditionally, during economic recessions, students tend toward transfer (since few immediate jobs are available) and toward taking heavier academic loads (since they are working less than usual or not working at all). While a normal reaction to these conditions, the course changes by colleges due to fiscal

constraints during this decade have prevented the colleges from offering the full schedule of classes that Californians wanted to take. One of the pertinent questions of this report, therefore, is how colleges' registration priorities may have moderated or reinforced the impact on access of college course cuts.

Other pertinent questions addressed in this study are:

1. What criteria are used for registration priorities and what is their typical order?
2. How are continuing, matriculated students (the Board's top priority) ranked for registration?
3. How are students with baccalaureate degrees (the Board's and the Legislature's lowest priority) ranked for registration?
4. What changes in registration priorities were made by colleges following adoption of the Board of Governors' guidelines?

## Registration Priorities

1. What criteria are used for registration priorities and what is their typical order?

Of the 107 community colleges surveyed this year,


- four do not have formal registration priorities.
- one hundred three have formal registration priorities.

The four colleges who have no formal registration priorities, do conduct pre-registration. Consequently, one might argue that these colleges afford implicit priority to continuing students who have a distinct advantage—in a pre-registration process—over returning students who, in turn, probably have an advantage (because of their knowledge) over new students.

Of the 103 colleges who have formal registration priorities, the most frequently used criteria for priority registration are:

- Continuing Students
- DSPS and EOPS Students
- Units Completed
- Matriculated Students (See Chart 1, and Appendix C, Table 1.)

Chart 1  
**CRITERIA FOR REGISTRATION PRIORITIES**  
 Number of Districts Using, 1993-94



SOURCE: Appendix C, Table 1.

Of these categories, only DSPS and EOPS students are specifically cited in the law.

**2. How are continuing, matriculated students (the Board's top priority) ranked for registration?**

Nearly nine out of every ten districts provide registration priority to continuing students and three out of every four districts provide priority to DSPS and EOPS students. Two of every five districts note matriculation as one of the criteria for priority registration.

EOPS and DSPS students are most often ranked first (Appendix C, Table 2). Consequently, the average priority ranking in 1993-94 was:

| Category               | Rank |
|------------------------|------|
| DSPS and EOPS Students | 1.40 |
| Continuing Students    | 1.84 |
| Units Completed        | 3.09 |
| Matriculated Students  | 3.55 |
| Special Majors         | 4.00 |
| Grade Point Average    | 4.25 |
| Returning Students     | 4.82 |

(Refer to Appendix C, Table 3)

The typical priority is one in which DSPS/EOPS students are ranked first and continuing students ranked second, followed by several other categories (Appendix C, Table 4).

Ten of the eighteen multi-college districts employ differing registration priorities among their colleges. Generally, the larger colleges—in a district—use a more elaborate set of priorities than do the smaller colleges in that district. In three districts, the larger colleges added units of completion as a criterion, while in three districts, matriculation was added by large colleges as a criterion.

**3. How are students with baccalaureate degrees (the Board of Governors' and the Legislature's lowest priority) ranked for registration?**

Both the Legislature (in SB 766, 1992) and the Board guidelines afford lowest priority for registration to students with baccalaureate degrees. One-third of the community colleges explicitly or implicitly (through a cut-off of completed units) assign a lower priority to those with baccalaureate degrees.

Of those 103 colleges with written priorities,

- twenty-eight explicitly assign lower registration priority to students with baccalaureate degrees.
- five implicitly assign lower priority to students with baccalaureate degrees through a cut-off on units completed.
- seventy do not reference students with baccalaureate degrees in their priorities.

**4. What changes in registration priorities were made by colleges following adoption of the Board of Governors' guidelines?**

In reviewing the past year's (1993-94) changes to the prior year's (1992-93) registration priorities, we find the following categories to have increased most in use:

- Matriculated Students
- Returning students
- Units Completed
- Grade Point Average

(Refer to Appendix C, Table 1.)

Of the 58 community college districts for which we have information on registration priorities in both years:

- twenty did not make a change to their priorities.
- thirty-eight changed their priorities.

(Refer to Appendix C, Table 5.)


For those 38 districts making changes:

- nine adopted written priorities, two including matriculation.
- ten added matriculation to existing priorities.
- three raised the priority ranking of matriculation.
- two lowered the priority ranking of matriculation.
- fourteen changed criteria other than matriculation.

(Refer to Chart 2, page 8, and Appendix C, Table 5.)

Thus, two of every three districts changed their priorities and of those that did change, 63 percent dealt with matriculation, a central consideration, along with continuing status, in the Board guidelines. Only a few districts who made changes gave priority, among matriculated students, to recent high school graduates over other new students—as called for in the Board guidelines. However, as we see below, colleges are more actively recruiting high school graduates.

Chart 2: CHANGES TO PRIORITIES  
1992-93 TO 1993-94



SOURCE: Appendix C, Table 5 and Appendix D.

A frequent change in registration priorities, from 1992-93 to 1993-94, was to rank DSPS and EOPS students ahead of continuing students.

### Other Practices to Manage Enrollments

Besides establishing priorities for the registration of students, colleges have other enrollment management techniques they may employ to produce the number of student enrollments that is consistent with both the college's mission and with its fiscal capability. Generally, enrollment management (EM) is defined as a process of identifying enrollment goals and establishing policies and procedures to achieve these goals.

Many EM systems and models have been developed by colleges and universities and their content and (occasionally) their results are described in the literature. Organized EM efforts generally seek one or more of three different goals which are to:

1. Expand or ensure enrollment growth (generally to counteract an expected decline in the potential pool of students),
2. Control or reduce enrollment (generally to fit within declining resources), and
3. Adjust the composition of enrollment to ensure quality, diversity or some other desired condition.

An organized EM effort involves a number of different functions at a college; obviously, changes in curriculum will impact enrollment just as changes in student services, in admissions for example, will. Thus, the most successful efforts are those where goals are explicit and implementation is well coordinated between instruction and student services.

Most four-year colleges and universities have and will continue to be involved in EM efforts that counteract the ongoing decline in 18-24 year-olds, the traditional four-year college-going population. This downward trend in 18-24 year-olds will continue, in most states, until the late 1990's.

By contrast, community colleges, because of their mission and open admissions policy, have been forced recently to consider means by which they can control enrollments, particularly in those states—like California—where available funding is declining in real terms.

Enrollment growth in the late 1980's resulted in California Community Colleges enrolling over five percent of their students without funding; i.e., "overcap." As noted above, recent concerns about who would be able to enroll led the Legislature, the Board of Governors', and college districts to consider ways of dealing with continuing enrollment demand that couldn't be met because of fiscal constraints.

Enrollment management can be thought of as containing up to seven different categories:

- Curriculum
- Marketing
- Admissions
- Registration (with or without priorities)
- Enrollment
- Pricing
- Retention

In order to provide further context for our study of registration priorities, our survey asked community college personnel to note which of these activities they had employed to manage enrollments over the past two years, 1992-93 and 1993-94.

Our results show considerable activity in curriculum change, marketing, registration, and increased delivery of instruction off-campus; fewer changes in admissions, articulation, student follow-up, and financial aid (Appendix E).

## Curriculum

Since 1990, colleges have cut nearly one of every ten course sections from their curriculum. (See the Chancellor's Office *Course and Curriculum Study, September 1994*.)

Of 46 colleges that indicated they made changes to the curriculum during the past two years,

- eleven added course sections.
- ten both added and deleted course sections.
- twenty-five deleted course sections.

(Refer to Appendix E, Table 1.)

Those deleting course sections did so in two basic ways:

Raising a section's "cut-off" point; i.e., the course enrollment that must be achieved to offer the course

Eliminating low enrollment course sections.

This is generally consistent with findings from the *Course and Curriculum Study*, which shows that three of every four community college districts reduced their course sections between fall 1990 and fall 1993, often in the areas of low enrollment classes.

## Marketing

Just over one-half of the community colleges (54 of 107) report they have changed their recent marketing tactics. However, most of these changes appear to have been toward generating more interest in community college enrollment on the part of high school students (targeted marketing), even while the available curriculum was being scaled back.


Of those colleges that changed their marketing strategy,

- thirty-five advertised more.
- seven advertised less.
- thirty-three recruited more, virtually always in local high schools.
- three recruited less.

(See Chart 3, below, and refer to Appendix E, Table 1.)

- thirteen worked more on articulation, mostly with local high schools and colleges.

Chart 3  
CHANGES IN RECENT RECRUITING



SOURCE: Appendix E, Table 1.

### Admissions and Registration

Very few changes have been made to admissions processes. However, over one-third of the colleges (thirty-eight) have changed their registration process. The single-most frequently implemented change was a shift to phone registration by fifteen colleges.

There were few changes (by sixteen colleges) to counseling which dealt with adding hours of service and/or staff. Very few academic calendar changes were reported. Four colleges reported moving to an earlier-start calendar—a change that invariably results in lowered enrollments.

Work with EM systems often is concerned with the dates by when students may add and drop classes. Students often "shop" (sign up for more class sections than they intend to pursue, then drop several early in the term) or they simply are unable to finish many of their classes, dropping them later in the term. Other things being equal, earlier add and drop dates force earlier student decisions and makes institutional EM planning easier. This was one of the areas which the Board guidelines encouraged colleges to investigate.

Four out of every five colleges close their add process by the end of the term's second week (Appendix E, Table 2), and all but four colleges close this process by the end of the third week. At the other end of the term, three of every five colleges allow students to drop courses as late as the thirteenth week or 75 percent of the way through the term; forty-four colleges allow drops during the fourteenth week or 80 percent of the way through the term.

### **Assessment, Follow-up, and Probation**

These activities typically are ways in which colleges improve the performance and retention of their students, and, therefore, are generally a part of strategies to increase both the quality and quantity of college enrollment. Board guidelines also drew attention to these activities.

Few California Community Colleges reported recent changes in these areas. A possible reason for this is that most significant changes probably had been made earlier in connection with implementation of the matriculation program.

Twenty colleges that report recent changes to their assessment process either (1) automated (upgraded their computer applications) or centralized their information on students, or (2) began to utilize new or more assessment tests.

Board guidelines suggested that colleges examine their student follow-up and academic probation policies. Six colleges report they revised their follow-up system recently, to institute an early-warning mechanism for better identification of student difficulties. In eighteen colleges that changed their probation practices, either standards for coming off probation were tightened or procedures for assigning counselors to students with academic problems were streamlined.

### **Pricing**

The major pricing impact on students resulted from the 1993 increases in enrollment fees for students with baccalaureate degrees (\$6 per unit to \$50 per unit) and for other credit students (\$6 to \$13). While accompanied by substantial increases in Board of Governors' financial aid through waivers, these fees still had a major impact, particularly in the spring 1993. (The impact these pricing changes had on

both students and curriculum is explored in Chancellor's Office studies of *Fee Impact* and *Course and Curriculum Change*.)

Despite the fee waiver policy, nearly one-half of community college students with baccalaureate degrees (60,000 of 127,000) withdrew in 1993. It is not clear how many other such students may have not enrolled because their registration priority did not enable them to obtain the classes they needed.

Twenty-two (of 107) colleges report they recently increased fees—other than the enrollment fee—over which they have control. Increases were made to fees for student centers (9), health services (5), and application (3), among others.

### **Delivery**

Of 105 colleges responding to this question,

- thirty changed their delivery methods.
- seventy-five did not change their delivery methods.

Sixteen colleges report increasing the amount of instruction they provide through contract education arrangements with business, industry, and other local agencies.

Of 28 colleges reporting changes in off-campus activity:

- twelve increased their class work at existing sites .
- five decreased their class work at existing sites.
- seven began class work in new facilities/sites.
- four increased their television offerings.

Eleven colleges report offering more short (less than term-length) classes and more classes during the afternoon.

## ***APPENDIX A***

---

### **Guidelines for Registration Priorities (for Students Enrolling in Credit Classes)**

*Adopted by the Board of Governors, May 1993*

## APPENDIX A

### Systemwide Guidelines for Registration Priorities

---

#### Background

The California Community Colleges grew from 1,174,000 student enrollment in 1985 to 1,508,000 students in 1990—an increase of 334,000 or 28 percent, in those five years. The increase mirrored the change in California's demography—one-half of the new students were either Asian or Hispanic—and significant gains were made in the enrollment of all categories of underrepresented students. The current, unprecedented enrollment demand results from: the recession, with the unemployed returning for job and career retraining; higher fees and fewer classes at the University of California and the California State University; and the continued population increase in California, especially in the traditionally underrepresented groups.

Despite this enrollment demand, cuts in funding forced the community colleges to cut staff and reduce course offerings by ten thousand course sections during the past two years. In addition, salary increases have been limited, and colleges are taking a variety of steps to limit expenditures by becoming more efficient. These steps and increased student fees have limited access and resulted in the halt in enrollment growth. It is estimated that the community colleges have been unable to accommodate the more than 100,000 students who wanted to enroll in each of the 1991 and 1992 academic years. The gains in access during the late 1990s are in danger of being reversed.

We now have an unprecedented enrollment demand at the same time that severe budget cuts are affecting the number of courses colleges are able to offer. This ultimately impacts the number of students who are able to get the courses they need.

In addition to the economic pressures, the Legislature and the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) are increasingly intervening in the responsibility of the colleges to provide access. This past year, the Legislature, in an attempt to respond to the high enrollment demand, decided to set priorities for the community colleges through the passage of differential fee legislation. Senate Bill 766 stated the intent of the Legislature that students who have not previously been awarded a baccalaureate or graduate degree are to be given priority for enrollment. The Assembly Higher Education Committee is holding hearings through the spring of 1993 to review the principles of the *Master Plan for Higher Education*. CPEC has convened an ad hoc committee on the financing and future of California higher education that is looking at the various roles of the higher education segments and fees for those students. In addition, the Legislative Analyst's Office has recommended "that the legislature adopt budget bill language and, in the long run

legislation, to implement either, or a combination, of the following policies: (1) Statewide enrollment priorities that focus on higher-priority students (those enrolled in transfer education and vocational training and as a secondary priority providing basic skills and ESL courses that are crucial for the workforce) with provisions to reallocate funds over time, or (2) higher fees and higher financial aid, because they would result in a more cost-effective use of resources than the current policies."

We, the California Community Colleges, need to respond to the changes in California and be ready with carefully thought out policy guidelines drafted by our educational leaders, working through the consultation process. If we do not do it ourselves there are any number of groups interested in doing it for us. Under current regulations, districts have the authority to establish registration priorities, and most districts have done so (see Appendix B). These priorities have been set for local purposes and not for statewide uniformity.

In July 1992, the Chancellor formed a task force of three community college trustees, three CEOs, three faculty, and three student representatives (see Appendix A) to draft a framework for policies and procedures on registration priorities. The task force believed that guidelines—not mandated regulations—would allow maximum flexibility for districts while providing uniformity for systemwide purposes.

In addition to the work of the task force, the Research and Analysis unit of the Chancellor's Office conducted a survey of current district priorities and practices (see Appendix B). Sixty-two districts responded; of those, fifty-two have explicit, written priorities and ten have no written priorities. Four multi-college districts have more than one set of priorities. Thus, we acquired information on fifty-six sets of enrollment priorities. The most frequently used criteria are:

|                               |       |     |
|-------------------------------|-------|-----|
| ▶ continuing students         | 50/56 | 89% |
| ▶ EOPS and DSPS students      | 43/56 | 77% |
| ▶ units completed             | 31/56 | 55% |
| ▶ matriculated students       | 16/56 | 29% |
| ▶ special majors and programs | 15/56 | 27% |

Other less frequently used criteria included concurrently enrolled high school students, returning students, GPA, unit load, high school origin, and district residents. Noting the order in which the commonly used criteria are ranked in the districts' enrollment priorities, a typical district enrollment priority is: EOPS and DSPS students, continuing students, special majors and programs, units completed, and matriculated students.

This survey information, along with the framework provided by the task force, has been circulated as a registration priorities document through the formal consultation process as well as informally through a number of other organizations. The community college Chief Instructional Officers, Chief Business Officers, Student Service Officers, Chief Executive Officers, Council of Organizations, and the Community

College Trustees Board, have all reached consensus in support of the registration priority guidelines as presented. The California Student Body Government Officers are not in support. The Academic Senate originally asked that the document be expanded to include enrollment priorities for noncredit and that another document be created on priorities for developing a schedule (both credit and noncredit) that would include priorities for programs, courses, and sections. It was determined by the Registration Priorities Task Force that these items raised by the Academic Senate, especially in the areas of curriculum, need to be addressed locally; that everyone on the task force has agreed to the broad framework of the policy guidelines, and to add other issues would narrow the constituencies that have been in support of the original document.

The Chancellor's Task Force on Faculty and Staff Diversity and Development; the Learning, Assessment, and Retention Consortium; and several individuals expressed some concerns about the priorities of disadvantaged (EOPS) and disabled (DSPS) students. Districts are authorized to provide special registration assistance to DSPS or EOPS students, as defined by statute, to provide equalization of educational opportunity (*California Code of Regulations* Section 58106). With respect to EOPS, *California Code of Regulations* Section 56232 requires that EOPS students receive "access services" that include registration assistance for priority enrollment pursuant to Section 58106. With respect to DSPS, Section 56026 authorizes services that include registration assistance, including priority enrollment assistance. In addition, federal requirements for reasonable accommodation may require registration priority to be given in specific instances. Also, the Board of Governors has recently adopted regulations and other policies that make student equity planning a high priority at the local level. Local and systemwide efforts on student equity will facilitate access into the college mainstream.

There have been a number of questions raised during the consultation process and those have been handled in a question-and-answer format at the end of this item.

## Analysis

For maximum effectiveness, these systemwide registration priorities are being proposed in the form of statewide guidelines, adopted by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges for use by the colleges in the system. It is the intent of the Chancellor's Office to conduct a survey, one year from the adoption of the guidelines, to determine the extent to which they have been considered and applied.

This item presents broad guidelines for registration priorities based upon the mission of the California Community Colleges, first articulated in the *Master Plan for Higher Education* in 1960, reaffirmed in AB 1725 (1988), and restated by statute in the Donahoe Higher Education Act (1990). This mission is to provide Californians access to quality programs in transfer and career education and in the mastery of basic skills and in English as a second language. Access to these programs is to be provided

to all California residents who have the capacity and motivation to benefit from such programs.

Based upon this mission statement, the following guiding principles are suggested for setting local registration priorities.

- Maintain student access and achieve student equity.
- Utilize matriculation and accountability processes to assist students to reach their educational goals.
- Offer curriculum in response to student educational plans and labor market needs.
- Apply existing regulations in a flexible manner to meet student needs in the best possible way.
- Provide a cooperative staff and a supportive environment for all students.
- Provide for local flexibility in implementation to address specific college and community needs.

Based upon the preceding principles, the following guidelines are suggested for registration priorities for credit students.

The California Community Colleges will give first priority of seats to matriculated students with goals to transfer; obtain vocational certificates, AA, or AS degrees; acquire entry-level job skills; or upgrade training.

**A. Matriculated Students**

1. Continuing students
2. Recent high school graduates
3. Other new and returning students
4. New students with a BA or higher degree(s)

**B. Nonmatriculated students**

1. Continuing students
2. New students
3. Students with a BA or higher degree(s)

In an attempt to provide leadership at the state level while providing for local autonomy, these guidelines also suggest some policy areas that local districts should re-examine.

1. **Add dates and drop dates for classes.** Does your college and/or district have students who are enrolling for 18 or 20 units but end up only completing 6 units? Do the add and drop dates at your college and/or district need to be changed?
2. **Grading, especially with regard to *incomplete* and *W*.** Should students at your college and/or district who have a large number of *Ws* fall into a lower priority category? Why do these students have so many *Ws*? Do they need special help, and is your college and/or district able to provide it?
3. **Academic progress.** Is your college and/or district conducting research to know the academic progress of students to reach their goals? Does the curriculum reflect what the students need to have in order to reach their educational goals?
4. **Probation and dismissal.** Does your college and/or district have realistic policies on probation and dismissal? Are these policies consistently enforced or followed?
5. **Research on persistence, retention, and student success to improve goal attainment.** What is the retention rate at your college and/or district? What is working or not working?

These guidelines and policies will assist local districts to reevaluate their existing policies and will enable those districts that have not already constructed a policy to do so. It is also proposed that the Board, in 1994, one year after the guidelines have been adopted, perform another survey of the districts to determine the extent to which these guidelines have been considered and applied.

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

### Enrollment Limitations and Registration Priorities

---

**Synopsis:** In order to assist the discussions on the issue of enrollment limitations and registration priorities, the legal parameters of this issue are set forth below in a question-and-answer format.

**1. What is the difference between a *regulation* and a *guideline*?**

A *regulation*, once it is adopted in accordance with specific procedures, has the force and effect of law. The Board of Governors can administratively enforce regulations. Also, interested parties can secure enforcement of regulations in a court of law. A *guideline* adopted by the Board of Governors does not have the force and effect of law. Districts are free to either accept or reject guidelines. In this sense, guidelines reflect the advice and encouragement of the Board of Governors.

Guidelines do not supersede regulations. Thus, these guidelines on registration priorities would do nothing to supersede existing provisions of Title 5, which authorize or direct districts to give registration priority to EOPS students (Section 56232), DSPS students (Section 56206), or to take other similar actions for purposes of student equity (Section 54220).

**2. What is the general policy on access to postsecondary education in California?**

The *Master Plan for Higher Education* (Education Code Sections 66201 and 66030) provides that each resident of California who has the capacity and motivation to benefit from higher education should have the opportunity to enroll in an institution of higher education. Once enrolled, each individual should have the opportunity to continue as long and as far as this capacity and motivation . . . will lead.

**3. What students are community colleges *required* to admit?**

Education Code Section 76000 requires community college governing boards to admit California residents who possess a high school diploma or the equivalent.

**4. What students are community colleges *authorized* to admit?**

*Education Code* Sections 76000 and 76001 authorize community college governing boards to admit: (1) nonresidents, (2) persons over 18 and capable of profiting from the instruction offered, and (3) K-12 students attending as special part-time or full-time students

**5. Are colleges required to provide all students admitted with all of the courses and programs they desire?**

There is no legal requirement that colleges provide admitted students with all of their program and course needs. Indeed, because community colleges are substantially underfunded, it is impossible for them to serve all students desiring education with all of the classes they desire. Choices about curriculum must be made, and there is no possible way to avoid the fact that whatever curriculum is chosen, there will be students who cannot get what they need in a timely manner.

**6. Are colleges required to establish a certain curriculum?**

*Education Code* Section 66010.4 specifies the mission of the community colleges and establishes priorities within the mission. Districts, however, retain authority (under the broad authority of *Education Code* Section 70902) to interpret these priorities to decide which courses and programs will actually be offered.

**7. Does a community college student, once admitted, have the right to take any course he or she chooses?**

Board regulations provide that in order to be claimed for apportionment, a course must be open to enrollment by any student who has been admitted to the college, except that:

- (a) students may be required to meet prerequisites, and
- (b) districts may establish enrollment limitations based on
  - (1) health and safety considerations,
  - (2) facility limitations,
  - (3) faculty workload,
  - (4) the availability of qualified instructors,
  - (5) funding limitations,
  - (6) the constraints of regional planning, or
  - (7) legal requirements imposed by statutes, regulations, or contracts.

8. **If a district does limit enrollment in a course, using one or more of the seven justifications listed above, does it have discretion in determining which students will have priority for enrolling in the course?**

Board regulations (*California Code of Regulations* Section 58106) currently provide that districts are to adopt "fair and equitable procedures" for determining who may be enrolled. Such procedures may limit enrollment on a "first come, first served" basis, or use other nonevaluative selection techniques to determine who may enroll, or limit enrollment to those students capable of safely performing required tasks. These regulations do not currently allow districts to limit enrollment on a competitive basis, nor do they allow districts to limit enrollment to specialized clientele. Further, the regulations (Section 58104) prohibit announcements of course offerings from being limited to a specialized clientele, nor may any group or individual receive prior notice for the purpose of preferential enrollment.

9. **Do districts have authority to determine the order in which students (or groups of students) have access to the registration process?**

While districts are somewhat limited in their authority to determine who may enroll in a given course, they do have broader authority to determine the order in which students or groups of students have access to the registration process. Districts are authorized to provide special registration assistance to handicapped (DSPS) or disadvantaged (EOPS) students, as defined by statute, to provide equalization of educational opportunity (*California Code of Regulations* Section 58106). With respect to EOPS, *California Code of Regulations* Section 56232 requires EOPS students to receive "access services" that include registration assistance for priority enrollment pursuant to Section 58106. With respect to DSPS, Section 56026 authorizes services to include registration assistance, including priority enrollment assistance. In addition, federal requirements for reasonable accommodation may require registration priority to be given in specific instances.

Districts are also authorized to establish registration procedures to provide for enrollment of students "... in accordance with a priority system established pursuant to legal authority by the local board of trustees." Under this broad authority, for instance, a district could give registration priority to continuing students, or matriculating students, or students in good standing (not on probation), or even students residing within the district.

Senate Bill 766 also provides the intent of the Legislature that students who have not previously been awarded a baccalaureate or graduate degree are to be given priority for enrollment.

**10. Do the add and drop dates at your college need to be changed?**

In the *California Code of Regulations* Section 55758 it states, "withdrawal from a class or classes shall be authorized through the last day of the fourteenth week of instruction (or 75% of a term, whichever is less). The governing board, however, may establish a final withdrawal date which prohibits withdrawal after a designated point in time between the end of the fourth week of instruction (or 30% of a term, whichever is less) and the last day of the fourteenth week of instruction (or 75% of a term, whichever is less)." Local district governing boards currently have the authority to establish drop dates between the fourth and fourteenth weeks of a term. Local colleges need to determine whether their current policy benefits the most students.

**11. What is the difference between a *matriculated* and a *nonmatriculated* student?**

Each district specifically defines "matriculated." The Chancellor's Office staff operates under the premise that a matriculated student is someone who has received the services of two or more components of matriculation in addition to admission. The components of matriculation are: admission, assessment, orientation, counseling, and follow-up. Every student is processed through admissions and therefore not exempt from the admissions component of matriculation.

**12. How will new students be accommodated if it is necessary to be a "matriculated" student to gain a high priority for registration? Will students exempted from matriculation components be penalized and moved to the lowest priority for registration?**

Colleges offer assessment and orientation, and often counseling and/or advising, prior to enrollment for the first term. In fact, many colleges offer a full array of services at the feeder high schools in the spring and during the summer. Therefore, new students who take advantage of these opportunities can then be given a higher priority in registration. If new students desire to participate in the components of matriculation prior to registration for their first term but the college is unable to accommodate them, the college should consider a registration process that includes a modified orientation and one term in which to complete the components, so that the student who was unable to be served is not penalized.

There is sufficient flexibility in the registration priority guidelines for districts to develop their procedures to handle this process as well as to determine the exemption policy and the implementation of the registration procedures.

Procedures that do not unduly penalize exempt students from priority registration at the college need to be in place. For example, a student might be exempt from the assessment component because the English and math general education requirements were completed at another college. This student should not be denied priority because the assessment was not needed. This same student might also be exempted from orientation for a number of reasons. In other words, students' exemption status and the reasons for the exemptions should be a consideration in establishing the registration priority policy of the district. Section 55514(f) requires that colleges collect exemption information by type of exemption. In addition, the college should be able to differentiate the BA degree exemption from other types of exemption. It is clearly the intent of the Legislature that BA holders are not to be given priority registration.

(Note: Title 5 regulations require colleges to notify exempt students of their right to participate in matriculation regardless of the exemption status. However, this is not to suggest that students should receive unnecessary services in order to gain a higher registration priority.)

**13. Should there be a priority difference between high school students and other new students?**

Some local districts have commitments to their local high schools and should continue with that commitment. These are guidelines and are meant to allow for the flexibility that local districts need to reflect their local community needs.

## ***APPENDIX B***

---

**Survey Instrument for 1994 Study  
of Community College Registration Priorities  
and Other Enrollment Management Practices**

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

1107 NINTH STREET  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814  
(916) 445-8752



## APPENDIX B

March 9, 1994

TO: Chancellors/Presidents

FROM: David Mertes *DM*  
Chancellor

SUBJECT: REGISTRATION PRIORITY GUIDELINES

Synopsis: In May 1993, the Board of Governors adopted guidelines for registration priorities for students enrolling in credit courses. These priorities had been developed by a task force of college trustees, chief executive officers, faculty, students, and staff.

At the time the Board adopted these guidelines, we made a commitment to the Board that, in one year, we would conduct a survey to determine the extent to which these guidelines had been considered and applied.

I have enclosed a survey for this purpose. Besides responding to the Board's interest, this survey, along with other information -- such as our *1993 Study of Fee Impact* and an analysis of course and curriculum changes (forthcoming) -- will help our continuing effort to identify the impact of recent budget cuts and student fee increases. This information is extremely important as we look at our ability to carry out the Master Plan mission of providing open access to postsecondary education for California adults.

If you manage a multi-college district and registration priorities differ among your colleges, please see that a separate questionnaire is completed and returned by each college.

Requested Action: Please have staff complete the questionnaire and return it to the Research and Analysis Unit by March 23, 1994. If you have any questions regarding this survey, please call Chuck McIntyre, Director of Research and Analysis, at (916) 327-5887.

Enclosure

cc: Rita Cepeda  
Thelma Scott-Skillman  
Judy Walters  
Chuck McIntyre  
Taron Reeves

**SURVEY ON PRIORITIES FOR REGISTRATION IN CREDIT COURSES, 1993-94**

**COMPLETE AND RETURN TO RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS BY 3/23/94!**

1. Do you have a "priority system" for registering students in 1993-94? ☐ YES ☐ NO  
 If YES, are these priorities in writing?  
☐ NO ☐ YES If your priorities are in writing, PLEASE SEND US A COPY!

2. Registration priorities are only one of several ways to manage enrollments. Please note other steps you may have taken to manage enrollments during the past two years.

**A. CHANGES TO THE CURRICULUM: PROGRAMS, COURSES, SECTIONS?**

☐ NO ☐ YES If YES, please describe briefly what you did and the results. Use additional pages if necessary.

**B. CHANGES IN YOUR MARKETING: ADVERTISING, RECRUITING, ARTICULATION?**

☐ NO ☐ YES If YES, please describe:

**C. CHANGES IN ADMISSIONS, REGISTRATION, COUNSELING AND SCHEDULING?**

☐ NO ☐ YES If YES, please describe:

When is your last day to add classes? (week of term)

When is your last day to drop classes? (check one)

☐ other: specify...

☐ Last day of 14th week.

☐ 75% of a term

**D. CHANGES IN ASSESSMENT, FOLLOW-UP, AND PROBATION STANDARDS?**

☐ NO ☐ YES If YES, please describe:

**E. CHANGES IN FEES AND FINANCIAL AID?**

☐ NO ☐ YES If YES, please describe:

**F. CHANGES IN DELIVERY: USE OF CONTRACTS, OFF-CAMPUS CLASSES,...ETC.**

☐ NO ☐ YES If YES, please describe:

## ***APPENDIX C***

---

### **Summary of College Registration Priorities** *(1992-93 and 1993-94)*

## APPENDIX C

### SUMMARY OF COLLEGE REGISTRATION PRIORITIES 1992-93 AND 1993-94

NOTE: Total counts in the Tables in Appendices C and D will not agree because of the uneven response on the two surveys of registration priorities in 1992-93 and 1993-94.

Of the 71 districts,

58 have provided information on the criteria and their priority ranking for student registration in both years.

10 have provided information on the criteria used, but not their priority ranking for student registration in both years.

3 have not provided any information on registration priorities for for 1992-93.

|            | District n<br>1992-93 | District n<br>1993-94 |
|------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Appendix C |                       |                       |
| Table 1    | 68                    | 68                    |
| Table 2    | 52                    | 56                    |
| Table 3    | 58                    | 58                    |
| Table 4    | 58                    | 58                    |
| Table 5    | 58                    | 58                    |
| Appendix D | 58                    | 58                    |

**Table 1**  
**Frequency that Student Types are given Priority Registration**

| 1992-93 |                | 1993-94 |                | % CHG.<br>in Ratio |
|---------|----------------|---------|----------------|--------------------|
| n       | Ratio<br>Using | n       | Ratio<br>Using |                    |

**RANKED BY FREQUENCY OF USE**

|                     |    |      |    |      |       |
|---------------------|----|------|----|------|-------|
| Continuing Students | 48 | 0.71 | 59 | 0.87 | 22.9% |
| DSP&S, EOPS         | 41 | 0.60 | 51 | 0.75 | 24.4% |
| Units Completed     | 28 | 0.41 | 43 | 0.63 | 53.6% |
| Matriculated        | 14 | 0.21 | 25 | 0.37 | 78.6% |
| Special Majors      | 14 | 0.21 | 15 | 0.22 | 7.1%  |
| Returning Student   | 9  | 0.13 | 14 | 0.21 | 55.6% |
| GPA                 | 7  | 0.10 | 10 | 0.15 | 42.9% |
| H.S. Student        | 6  | 0.09 | 8  | 0.12 | 33.3% |
| Unit Load           | 5  | 0.07 | 6  | 0.09 | 20.0% |
| H.S. Origin         | 4  | 0.06 | 5  | 0.07 | 25.0% |
| District Resident   | 2  | 0.03 | 2  | 0.03 | 0.0%  |

**RANKED BY CHANGE IN RELATIVE FREQUENCY OF USE**

|                     |    |      |    |      |       |
|---------------------|----|------|----|------|-------|
| Matriculated        | 14 | 0.21 | 25 | 0.37 | 78.6% |
| Returning Student   | 9  | 0.13 | 14 | 0.21 | 55.6% |
| Units Completed     | 28 | 0.41 | 43 | 0.63 | 53.6% |
| GPA                 | 7  | 0.10 | 10 | 0.15 | 42.9% |
| H.S. Student        | 6  | 0.09 | 8  | 0.12 | 33.3% |
| H.S. Origin         | 4  | 0.06 | 5  | 0.07 | 25.0% |
| DSP&S, EOPS         | 41 | 0.60 | 51 | 0.75 | 24.4% |
| Continuing Students | 48 | 0.71 | 59 | 0.87 | 22.9% |
| Unit Load           | 5  | 0.07 | 6  | 0.09 | 20.0% |
| Special Majors      | 14 | 0.21 | 15 | 0.22 | 7.1%  |
| District Resident   | 2  | 0.03 | 2  | 0.03 | 0.0%  |

SOURCE: Chancellor's Office, July 1994.

prior2a.wk1

**Table 2**  
**Times Criteria Ranked First in Registration Priority**

|                     | 1992-93 |       | 1993-94 |       |
|---------------------|---------|-------|---------|-------|
|                     | n       | Ratio | n       | Ratio |
| DSPS/EOPS           | 22      | 0.42  | 33      | 0.59  |
| Continuing Students | 22      | 0.42  | 19      | 0.34  |
| Units Completed     | 0       | 0.00  | 0       | 0.00  |
| Returning Student   | 0       | 0.00  | 0       | 0.00  |
| Matriculated        | 3       | 0.06  | 1       | 0.02  |
| Special Majors      | 1       | 0.02  | 0       | 0.00  |
| GPA                 | 0       | 0.00  | 0       | 0.00  |
| H.S. Origin         | 1       | 0.02  | 1       | 0.02  |
| District Resident   | 1       | 0.02  | 1       | 0.02  |
| H.S. Student        | 1       | 0.02  | 1       | 0.02  |
| Unit Load           | 1       | 0.02  | 0       | 0.00  |
| Total               | 52      | 1.00  | 56      | 1.00  |

**Table 3**  
**Ranking of Criteria Used for Priority Registration**

| 1992-93 Ranking     | AVERAGE |       | 1993-94 Ranking     | AVERAGE |       |
|---------------------|---------|-------|---------------------|---------|-------|
|                     | 92-93   | 93-94 |                     | 92-93   | 93-94 |
| DSPS/EOPS           | 1.40    | 1.41  | DSPS/EOPS           | 1.40    | 1.41  |
| Continuing Students | 1.58    | 1.84  | Continuing Students | 1.58    | 1.84  |
| Units Completed     | 2.77    | 3.09  | Units Completed     | 2.77    | 3.09  |
| Matriculated        | 3.15    | 3.55  | Matriculated        | 3.15    | 3.55  |
| Special Majors      | 3.42    | 4.00  | Special Majors      | 3.42    | 4.00  |
| Returning Student   | 3.83    | 4.82  | GPA                 | 4.57    | 4.25  |
| GPA                 | 4.57    | 4.25  | Returning Student   | 3.83    | 4.82  |
| H.S. Origin         | 1.00    | 2.50  |                     |         |       |
| District Resident   | 1.50    | 1.00  |                     |         |       |
| H.S. Student        | 3.50    | 3.17  |                     |         |       |
| Unit Load           | 3.00    | 3.40  |                     |         |       |

SOURCE: Chancellor's Office, July 1994.

ranka.wk1

**Table 4**  
**Most Common Types of Registration Priorities**

|                                                   | USE in  |         |
|---------------------------------------------------|---------|---------|
|                                                   | 1992-93 | 1993-94 |
| 1. DSPS/EOPS, 2. Continuing, ... + others         | 13      | 26      |
| 1. Continuing, ... + others, but not EOPS/DSPS... | 14      | 12      |
| 1. DSPS/EOPS, ... + others, but not Continuing... | 9       | 4       |
| 1. Continuing, 2. DSPS/EOPS, ... + others         | 5       | 5       |
| 1. DSPS/EOPS...no others                          | 3       | 2       |
| 1. Continuing, 2. DSPS/EOPS, ...no others...      | 2       | 2       |
| 1. DSPS/EOPS, 2. Continuing, ...no others...      | 5       | 1       |
| 1. Continuing, ...no others                       | 1       | 1       |
| Others                                            | 6       | 5       |
| Total                                             | 58      | 58      |

SOURCE: Chancellor's Office, July 1994.

ranka.wk1

**Table 5**  
**Changes in Criteria Used for Priority Registration**

| District     | CHANGE |     | CHARACTER OF CHANGE                                     |
|--------------|--------|-----|---------------------------------------------------------|
|              | NO     | YES |                                                         |
| ANTELOPE     |        | 1   | Added "spec.maj. #5                                     |
| BUTTE        |        | 1   | Add units compl.,returning #3,4                         |
| CABRILLO     |        | 1   | Add priority for student employees                      |
| CERRITOS     | 1      |     |                                                         |
| CHABOT       |        | 1   | Added EOPS/DSP&S to #1 ahead of Continuing              |
| CHAFFEY      |        | 1   | Added matric + others to EOPS/DSPS                      |
| CITRUS       |        | 1   | Added EOPS/DSPS, GPA, matric, regurng to continuing...  |
| COAST        |        | 1   | Removed spec majors, added other criteria               |
| CONTRA CO    |        | 1   | Dropped High School students                            |
| DESERT       |        | 1   | Added spec majors...                                    |
| EL CAMINO    | 1      |     |                                                         |
| FOOTHILL     |        | 1   | Shifted from cont'g to EOPS/DSPS, etc.                  |
| FRE-OHLO     |        | 1   | Added matric and units completed                        |
| GLENDALE     | 1      |     |                                                         |
| GROSSM       | 1      |     |                                                         |
| HARTNELL     |        | 1   | Now written w cont'g, units compl.                      |
| IMPERIAL     | 1      |     |                                                         |
| LAKE TAHOE   |        | 1   | Now written, priority for EOPS/DSPS and units completed |
| LASSEN       | 1      |     |                                                         |
| LONG BCH     | 1      |     |                                                         |
| LOS RIOS     |        | 1   | Added matric, switched EOPS/DSPS over cont'g            |
| L.A.         |        | 1   | Added matric, elevated EOPs/DSPS                        |
| MARIN        |        | 1   | Changed order, added EOPS/DSPS and h.s. origin          |
| MERCED       |        | 1   | Added units completed                                   |
| MIRA COSTA   |        | 1   | Dropped continuing and special majors as priority       |
| MONTEREY     |        | 1   | Now written w cont'g + returning                        |
| MT SAN ANT'O |        | 1   | Dropped unit load, added matriculation                  |
| NAPA         |        | 1   | Added returning students                                |
| NORANG       |        | 1   | Added units completed..                                 |
| PALOMAR      |        | 1   | Added EOPS/DSPS, reduced matric                         |
| PASADENA     |        | 1   | Elim dist res, added units compl.                       |
| PERALTA      |        | 1   | Now written w EOPS                                      |
| REDWOODS     |        | 1   | Matric up, units compl. down                            |
| RIVERSIDE    |        | 1   | Now written w cont'g + units completed                  |
| RSANTI       |        | 1   | Shift...matric #1!!                                     |
| SADDLE       | 1      |     |                                                         |
| SAN BERN     | 1      |     |                                                         |
| SAN CLARIT   | 1      |     |                                                         |
| SAN DIEGO    |        | 1   | Replace spec maj by Matric at #3                        |
| SAN JOAQUIN  | 1      |     |                                                         |
| SAN JOSE     | 1      |     |                                                         |
| SAN L O      |        | 1   | Add units compl as #2                                   |
| SAN MATEO    |        | 1   | Add EOPS/DSPS as #2                                     |
| SANTA BAR    | 1      |     |                                                         |

ranka.wk1

**Table 5 (Continued)**  
**Changes in Criteria Used for Priority Registration**

| District      | CHANGE    |           | CHARACTER OF CHANGE                                |
|---------------|-----------|-----------|----------------------------------------------------|
|               | NO        | YES       |                                                    |
| SANTA MO      | 1         |           |                                                    |
| SEQUOIAS      |           | 1         | Now written w EOPS/DSPS, cont'g, units compl., gpa |
| SIERRA        |           | 1         | Add cont'g as #2, matric as #4                     |
| SISKIYOU      | 1         |           |                                                    |
| SOLANO        |           | 1         | Matric from #1 to #4                               |
| SONOMA        |           | 1         | Add Matric as #3                                   |
| SOUTHWEST     | 1         |           |                                                    |
| STATE CEN     |           | 1         | EOPS/DSPS from #5 to #1, Matric at #7              |
| VENTURA       | 1         |           |                                                    |
| VICTOR VAL    |           | 1         | Now written w matric as #2                         |
| WEST HILLS    | 1         |           |                                                    |
| WEST KERN     |           | 1         | Now written w matric as #3                         |
| WEST VAL      | 1         |           | Matric still #4                                    |
| YOSEMITE      | 1         |           | No matric....                                      |
| <b>TOTALS</b> | <b>20</b> | <b>38</b> | ranka.wk1                                          |

COMMENTS: Of the 38 changes,

- 9 are toward written priorities, with 2 adding matriculation
- 9 added matriculation
- 3 raised the priority ranking of matriculation
- 2 lowered the priority ranking of matriculation
- 15 dealt with changes in criteria other than matriculation

SOURCE: Chancellor's Office, July 1994.

## ***APPENDIX D***

---

### **Community College District Registration Priorities** ***(1992-93 and 1993-94)***

## Registration Priorities

| District            | Priorities Written |      | Priorities DSPS/EOPS |      | Continuing Students |      | Unit Load |      | Units Completed |      | Priorities GPA |      | Matriculated |      | H.S. Origin |      | Special Majors |      | District Resident |      | H.S. Students |      | Return Student |      | District            |
|---------------------|--------------------|------|----------------------|------|---------------------|------|-----------|------|-----------------|------|----------------|------|--------------|------|-------------|------|----------------|------|-------------------|------|---------------|------|----------------|------|---------------------|
|                     | 1992               | 1993 | 1992                 | 1993 | 1992                | 1993 | 1992      | 1993 | 1992            | 1993 | 1992           | 1993 | 1992         | 1993 | 1992        | 1993 | 1992           | 1993 | 1992              | 1993 | 1992          | 1993 | 1992           | 1993 |                     |
| Antelope Valley     | yes                | yes  | 1                    | 1    | 3                   | 3    | 0         | 0    | 4               | 4    | 0              | 0    | 0            | 0    | 2           | 2    | 0              | 5    | 0                 | 0    | 1             | 1    | 0              | 0    | Antelope Valley     |
| Butte               | yes                | yes  | 1                    | 1    | 2                   | 2    | 0         | 0    | 0               | 3    | 0              | 0    | 0            | 0    | 0           | 0    | 0              | 0    | 0                 | 0    | 0             | 0    | 0              | 4    | Butte               |
| Cabrillo            | yes                | yes  | 0                    | 0    | 1                   | 0    | 0         | 0    | 0               | 0    | 0              | 0    | 0            | 0    | 0           | 0    | 0              | 0    | 0                 | 0    | 0             | 0    | 0              | 0    | Cabrillo            |
| Cerritos            | yes                | yes  | 0                    | 0    | 1                   | 1    | 3         | 3    | 2               | 2    | 4              | 4    | 0            | 0    | 0           | 0    | 0              | 0    | 0                 | 0    | 0             | 0    | 0              | 0    | Cerritos            |
| Chabot-Las Positas  | yes                | yes  | 0                    | 1    | 1                   | 2    | 0         | 0    | 0               | 3    | 0              | 0    | 0            | 0    | 0           | 0    | 0              | 0    | 0                 | 0    | 0             | 0    | 2              | 4    | Chabot-Las Positas  |
| Chaffey             | yes                | yes  | 1                    | 1    | 0                   | 2    | 0         | 0    | 0               | 0    | 0              | 0    | 0            | 4    | 0           | 3    | 1              | 0    | 0                 | 0    | 0             | 0    | 0              | 5    | Chaffey             |
| Citrus              | yes                | yes  | 0                    | 4    | 1                   | 1    | 0         | 0    | 2               | 3    | 0              | 3    | 0            | 6    | 0           | 0    | 0              | 0    | 0                 | 0    | 0             | 0    | 0              | 5    | Citrus              |
| Coast               | yes                | yes  | 1                    | 1    | 3                   | 2    | 0         | 0    | 0               | 0    | 0              | 4    | 0            | 0    | 0           | 0    | 2              | 0    | 0                 | 0    | 0             | 5    | 0              | 0    | Coast               |
| Contra Costa        | yes                | yes  | 1                    | 1    | 0                   | 0    | 0         | 0    | 3               | 2    | 0              | 0    | 5            | 0    | 0           | 0    | 0              | 0    | 0                 | 0    | 6             | 0    | 0              | 0    | Contra Costa        |
| Desert              | yes                | yes  | 2                    | 2    | 1                   | 1    | 0         | 0    | 4               | 3    | 0              | 0    | 3            | 3    | 0           | 0    | 0              | 5    | 0                 | 0    | 0             | 0    | 0              | 0    | Desert              |
| El Camino           | yes                | yes  | 1                    | 1    | 2                   | 2    | 4         | 4    | 3               | 3    | 5              | 5    | 0            | 0    | 0           | 0    | 6              | 6    | 0                 | 0    | 0             | 0    | 0              | 0    | El Camino           |
| Foothill-DeAnza     | yes                | yes  | 2                    | 1    | 1                   | 3    | 0         | 0    | 3               | 4    | 0              | 0    | 0            | 0    | 0           | 0    | 4              | 2    | 0                 | 0    | 0             | 0    | 0              | 0    | Foothill-DeAnza     |
| Fremont-Ohlone      | yes                | yes  | 1                    | 1    | 2                   | 2    | 0         | 0    | 0               | 3    | 0              | 0    | 0            | 4    | 0           | 0    | 0              | 0    | 0                 | 0    | 0             | 0    | 3              | 3    | Fremont-Ohlone      |
| Glendale            | yes                | yes  | 2                    | 2    | 1                   | 1    | 0         | 0    | 0               | 4    | 0              | 0    | 0            | 0    | 0           | 0    | 4              | 4    | 1                 | 1    | 3             | 3    | 0              | 0    | Glendale            |
| Grossmont-Cuyamaca  | yes                | yes  | 0                    | 0    | 1                   | 1    | 0         | 0    | 2               | 0    | 0              | 0    | 0            | 0    | 0           | 0    | 0              | 0    | 0                 | 0    | 0             | 0    | 0              | 0    | Grossmont-Cuyamaca  |
| Hartnell            | no                 | yes  | 0                    | 0    | 0                   | 1    | 0         | 0    | 0               | 0    | 0              | 0    | 0            | 0    | 0           | 0    | 0              | 0    | 0                 | 0    | 0             | 0    | 0              | 0    | Hartnell            |
| Imperial            | yes                | yes  | 1                    | 1    | 2                   | 2    | 0         | 0    | 0               | 0    | 0              | 0    | 0            | 0    | 0           | 0    | 0              | 0    | 0                 | 0    | 0             | 0    | 0              | 0    | Imperial            |
| Lake Tahoe          | no                 | yes  | 0                    | 1    | 0                   | 0    | 0         | 0    | 0               | 2    | 0              | 0    | 0            | 0    | 0           | 0    | 0              | 0    | 0                 | 0    | 0             | 0    | 0              | 0    | Lake Tahoe          |
| Lassen              | no                 | no   | 0                    | 0    | 0                   | 0    | 0         | 0    | 0               | 0    | 0              | 0    | 0            | 0    | 0           | 0    | 0              | 0    | 0                 | 0    | 0             | 0    | 0              | 0    | Lassen              |
| Long Beach          | yes                | yes  | 2                    | 2    | 1                   | 1    | 0         | 0    | 0               | 0    | 0              | 0    | 0            | 0    | 0           | 0    | 0              | 0    | 0                 | 0    | 0             | 0    | 0              | 0    | Long Beach          |
| Los Angeles         | yes                | yes  | 0                    | 1    | 1                   | 2    | 0         | 0    | 0               | 0    | 0              | 0    | 0            | 3    | 0           | 0    | 0              | 0    | 0                 | 0    | 0             | 0    | 0              | 0    | Los Angeles         |
| Los Rios            | yes                | yes  | 2                    | 1    | 1                   | 2    | 0         | 0    | 0               | 0    | 0              | 0    | 0            | 3    | 0           | 0    | 0              | 0    | 0                 | 0    | 0             | 0    | 0              | 0    | Los Rios            |
| Marin               | yes                | yes  | 0                    | 4    | 1                   | 1    | 0         | 0    | 2               | 0    | 0              | 0    | 0            | 0    | 0           | 4    | 0              | 0    | 0                 | 0    | 0             | 0    | 0              | 0    | Marin               |
| Merced              | yes                | yes  | 1                    | 1    | 0                   | 2    | 0         | 0    | 0               | 4    | 0              | 0    | 0            | 0    | 0           | 0    | 0              | 0    | 0                 | 0    | 0             | 0    | 0              | 0    | Merced              |
| MiraCosta           | yes                | yes  | 3                    | 3    | 1                   | 1    | 0         | 0    | 0               | 3    | 0              | 0    | 2            | 2    | 0           | 0    | 4              | 0    | 0                 | 0    | 0             | 0    | 0              | 0    | MiraCosta           |
| Monterey Peninsula  | no                 | yes  | 0                    | 0    | 0                   | 1    | 0         | 0    | 0               | 3    | 0              | 0    | 0            | 0    | 0           | 0    | 0              | 0    | 0                 | 0    | 0             | 0    | 0              | 3    | Monterey Peninsula  |
| Mt. San Antonio     | yes                | yes  | 1                    | 1    | 3                   | 3    | 1         | 0    | 5               | 0    | 6              | 0    | 4            | 5    | 0           | 0    | 2              | 2    | 0                 | 0    | 0             | 0    | 0              | 0    | Mt. San Antonio     |
| Napa Valley         | yes                | yes  | 1                    | 1    | 2                   | 2    | 0         | 0    | 0               | 0    | 0              | 0    | 3            | 3    | 0           | 0    | 0              | 0    | 0                 | 0    | 0             | 0    | 0              | 4    | Napa Valley         |
| North Orange County | yes                | yes  | 1                    | 1    | 2                   | 2    | 0         | 0    | 0               | 4    | 0              | 0    | 0            | 0    | 0           | 0    | 0              | 0    | 0                 | 0    | 0             | 0    | 0              | 0    | North Orange County |
| Palomar             | yes                | yes  | 0                    | 1    | 2                   | 2    | 0         | 0    | 3               | 0    | 0              | 0    | 1            | 4    | 0           | 0    | 0              | 0    | 0                 | 0    | 0             | 0    | 0              | 0    | Palomar             |
| Pasadena Area       | yes                | yes  | 0                    | 0    | 1                   | 1    | 0         | 0    | 0               | 3    | 0              | 0    | 0            | 0    | 0           | 0    | 0              | 0    | 2                 | 0    | 0             | 0    | 0              | 0    | Pasadena Area       |
| Peralta             | no                 | no   | 0                    | 1    | 0                   | 0    | 0         | 0    | 0               | 3    | 0              | 0    | 0            | 0    | 0           | 0    | 0              | 0    | 0                 | 0    | 0             | 0    | 0              | 0    | Peralta             |
| Rancho Santiago     | no                 | yes  | 2                    | 2    | 3                   | 4    | 0         | 0    | 5               | 4    | 4              | 0    | 1            | 1    | 0           | 0    | 0              | 0    | 0                 | 0    | 0             | 3    | 0              | 0    | Rancho Santiago     |

## Registration Priorities (Continued)

|                        | Priorities<br>Written |           | Priorities<br>DSPS/EOPS |                        | Continuing<br>Students |              | Unit<br>Load |                    | Units<br>Completed |                   | Priorities<br>GPA |                   | Matricu-<br>lated |                | H.S.<br>Origin |                   | Special<br>Majors |                      | District<br>Resident |                  | H.S.<br>Students |                   | Return<br>Student |      |                        |
|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|-------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------|------------------------|
| DISTRICT               | 1992                  | 1993      | 1992                    | 1993                   | 1992                   | 1993         | 1992         | 1993               | 1992               | 1993              | 1992              | 1993              | 1992              | 1993           | 1992           | 1993              | 1992              | 1993                 | 1992                 | 1993             | 1992             | 1993              | 1993              | 1993 | DISTRICT               |
| Redwoods               | yes                   | yes       | 1                       | 1                      | 2                      | 2            | 0            | 0                  | 3                  | 2                 | 0                 | 0                 | 4                 | 3              | 0              | 0                 | 0                 | 0                    | 0                    | 0                | 0                | 0                 | 0                 | 0    | Redwoods               |
| Riverside              | no                    | yes       | 0                       | 0                      | 0                      | 1            | 0            | 0                  | 0                  | 0                 | 0                 | 0                 | 0                 | 0              | 0              | 0                 | 0                 | 0                    | 0                    | 0                | 0                | 0                 | 0                 | 0    | Riverside              |
| Saddleback             | yes                   | yes       | 1                       | 1                      | 2                      | 2            | 0            | 0                  | 3                  | 2                 | 0                 | 0                 | 0                 | 0              | 0              | 0                 | 0                 | 0                    | 0                    | 0                | 0                | 0                 | 0                 | 0    | Saddleback             |
| San Bernardino         | no                    | no        | 0                       | 0                      | 0                      | 0            | 0            | 0                  | 0                  | 6                 | 0                 | 0                 | 0                 | 0              | 0              | 0                 | 0                 | 0                    | 0                    | 0                | 0                | 0                 | 0                 | 0    | San Bernardino         |
| San Diego              | yes                   | yes       | 2                       | 2                      | 1                      | 1            | 0            | 0                  | 0                  | 0                 | 0                 | 0                 | 0                 | 3              | 0              | 0                 | 3                 | 0                    | 0                    | 0                | 0                | 0                 | 0                 | 0    | San Diego              |
| San Joaquin Delta      | yes                   | yes       | 0                       | 0                      | 1                      | 1            | 3            | 3                  | 2                  | 2                 | 0                 | 0                 | 0                 | 0              | 0              | 0                 | 0                 | 0                    | 0                    | 0                | 0                | 0                 | 0                 | 0    | San Joaquin Delta      |
| San Jose-Evergreen     | yes                   | yes       | 3                       | 3                      | 1                      | 1            | 0            | 0                  | 2                  | 2                 | 0                 | 0                 | 0                 | 0              | 0              | 0                 | 0                 | 0                    | 0                    | 0                | 4                | 4                 | 5                 | 5    | San Jose-Evergreen     |
| San Luis Obispo County | yes                   | yes       | 2                       | 3                      | 3                      | 4            | 0            | 0                  | 0                  | 2                 | 0                 | 0                 | 0                 | 0              | 1              | 1                 | 0                 | 0                    | 0                    | 0                | 0                | 0                 | 0                 | 0    | San Luis Obispo County |
| San Mateo County       | yes                   | yes       | 0                       | 2                      | 1                      | 1            | 0            | 0                  | 2                  | 3                 | 0                 | 0                 | 0                 | 0              | 0              | 0                 | 0                 | 0                    | 0                    | 0                | 0                | 0                 | 0                 | 0    | San Mateo County       |
| Santa Barbara          | yes                   | yes       | 1                       | 1                      | 3                      | 3            | 4            | 4                  | 5                  | 5                 | 6                 | 6                 | 2                 | 2              | 0              | 0                 | 0                 | 0                    | 0                    | 0                | 0                | 0                 | 0                 | 0    | Santa Barbara          |
| Santa Clarita          | yes                   | yes       | 1                       | 1                      | 2                      | 2            | 0            | 0                  | 3                  | 3                 | 0                 | 0                 | 5                 | 5              | 0              | 0                 | 4                 | 4                    | 0                    | 0                | 0                | 0                 | 6                 | 6    | Santa Clarita          |
| Santa Monica           | yes                   | yes       | 0                       | 0                      | 1                      | 1            | 3            | 3                  | 2                  | 2                 | 4                 | 4                 | 0                 | 0              | 0              | 0                 | 0                 | 0                    | 0                    | 0                | 0                | 0                 | 0                 | 0    | Santa Monica           |
| Sequoias               | no                    | yes       | 0                       | 1                      | 0                      | 2            | 0            | 0                  | 0                  | 3                 | 0                 | 4                 | 0                 | 0              | 0              | 0                 | 0                 | 0                    | 0                    | 0                | 0                | 0                 | 0                 | 0    | Sequoias               |
| Sierra Joint           | yes                   | yes       | 1                       | 1                      | 0                      | 2            | 0            | 0                  | 2                  | 3                 | 0                 | 0                 | 0                 | 4              | 0              | 0                 | 0                 | 0                    | 0                    | 0                | 0                | 0                 | 3                 | 5    | Sierra Joint           |
| Siskiyou Joint         | no                    | no        | 0                       | 0                      | 0                      | 0            | 0            | 0                  | 0                  | 0                 | 0                 | 0                 | 0                 | 0              | 0              | 0                 | 0                 | 0                    | 0                    | 0                | 0                | 0                 | 0                 | 0    | Siskiyou Joint         |
| Solano County          | yes                   | yes       | 1                       | 1                      | 2                      | 2            | 0            | 0                  | 3                  | 3                 | 0                 | 0                 | 1                 | 4              | 0              | 0                 | 0                 | 0                    | 0                    | 0                | 0                | 0                 | 4                 | 5    | Solano County          |
| Sonoma County Jr       | yes                   | yes       | 0                       | 0                      | 1                      | 1            | 0            | 0                  | 2                  | 2                 | 0                 | 0                 | 0                 | 3              | 0              | 0                 | 0                 | 0                    | 0                    | 0                | 0                | 0                 | 0                 | 0    | Sonoma County Jr.      |
| Southwestern           | yes                   | yes       | 1                       | 1                      | 3                      | 3            | 0            | 0                  | 0                  | 0                 | 0                 | 0                 | 0                 | 0              | 0              | 0                 | 2                 | 2                    | 0                    | 0                | 0                | 0                 | 0                 | 0    | Southwestern           |
| State Center           | yes                   | yes       | 5                       | 1                      | 1                      | 2            | 0            | 0                  | 2                  | 3                 | 3                 | 4                 | 6                 | 7              | 0              | 0                 | 4                 | 5                    | 0                    | 0                | 0                | 0                 | 0                 | 0    | State Center           |
| Ventura County         | yes                   | yes       | 1                       | 1                      | 2                      | 2            | 0            | 0                  | 0                  | 0                 | 0                 | 0                 | 0                 | 0              | 0              | 0                 | 0                 | 0                    | 0                    | 0                | 0                | 0                 | 0                 | 0    | Ventura County         |
| Victor Valley          | no                    | yes       | 0                       | 1                      | 0                      | 3            | 0            | 0                  | 0                  | 0                 | 0                 | 0                 | 0                 | 2              | 0              | 0                 | 0                 | 0                    | 0                    | 0                | 0                | 3                 | 0                 | 4    | Victor Valley          |
| West Hills             | yes                   | yes       | 1                       | 1                      | 0                      | 0            | 0            | 0                  | 0                  | 0                 | 0                 | 0                 | 0                 | 0              | 0              | 0                 | 0                 | 0                    | 0                    | 0                | 0                | 0                 | 0                 | 0    | West Hills             |
| West Kern              | no                    | yes       | 0                       | 1                      | 0                      | 2            | 0            | 0                  | 0                  | 0                 | 0                 | 0                 | 0                 | 3              | 0              | 0                 | 0                 | 0                    | 0                    | 0                | 0                | 0                 | 0                 | 0    | West Kern              |
| West Valley-Mission    | yes                   | yes       | 1                       | 1                      | 2                      | 2            | 0            | 0                  | 3                  | 3                 | 0                 | 0                 | 4                 | 4              | 0              | 0                 | 5                 | 5                    | 0                    | 0                | 0                | 0                 | 0                 | 0    | West Valley-Mission    |
| Yosemite               | yes                   | yes       | 2                       | 2                      | 1                      | 1            | 0            | 0                  | 3                  | 3                 | 0                 | 0                 | 0                 | 0              | 0              | 0                 | 0                 | 0                    | 0                    | 0                | 0                | 0                 | 0                 | 0    | Yosemite               |
| TOTAL                  | yes                   | yes       | 49                      | 62                     | 68                     | 90           | 18           | 17                 | 72                 | 108               | 32                | 34                | 41                | 78             | 3              | 10                | 41                | 40                   | 3                    | 1                | 14               | 19                | 23                | 0    | TOTAL                  |
| TOTAL                  | ERROR                 | DSPS/EOPS |                         | Continuing<br>Students |                        | Unit<br>Load |              | Units<br>Completed |                    | Priorities<br>GPA |                   | Matricu-<br>lated |                   | H.S.<br>Origin |                | Special<br>Majors |                   | District<br>Resident |                      | H.S.<br>Students |                  | Return<br>Student |                   |      |                        |
|                        |                       | 1992      | 1993                    | 1992                   | 1993                   | 1992         | 1993         | 1992               | 1993               | 1992              | 1993              | 1992              | 1993              | 1992           | 1993           | 1992              | 1993              | 1992                 | 1993                 | 1992             | 1993             | 1992              | 1993              |      |                        |
| N                      |                       | 35        | 44                      | 43                     | 49                     | 6            | 5            | 26                 | 35                 | 7                 | 8                 | 13                | 22                | 3              | 4              | 12                | 10                | 2                    | 1                    | 4                | 6                | 6                 | 11                |      |                        |
| AVERAGE                |                       | 1.40      | 1.41                    | 1.58                   | 1.84                   | 3.00         | 3.40         | 2.77               | 3.09               | 4.57              | 4.25              | 3.15              | 3.55              | 1.00           | 2.50           | 3.42              | 4.00              | 1.50                 | 1.00                 | 3.50             | 3.17             | 3.83              | 4.82              |      |                        |

## ***APPENDIX E***

---

### **Enrollment Management Practices** *(Changes Undertaken in Last Two Years by Community Colleges)*

## APPENDIX E

Table 1

### ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES Changes Undertaken In Last Two Years by Colleges

| Changes To:             | Yes |       | No |       |
|-------------------------|-----|-------|----|-------|
| Curriculum              | 46  | 43.0% | 61 | 57.0% |
| Marketing               | 54  | 50.5% | 53 | 49.5% |
| Advertising             | 42  | 40.4% | 62 | 59.6% |
| Recruitment             | 36  | 34.6% | 68 | 65.4% |
| Articulation            | 13  | 12.5% | 91 | 87.5% |
| Admissions/Registration |     |       |    |       |
| Admissions              | 7   | 6.7%  | 97 | 93.3% |
| Registration            | 38  | 36.5% | 66 | 63.5% |
| Counseling              | 14  | 13.5% | 90 | 86.5% |
| Scheduling              | 9   | 9.0%  | 91 | 91.0% |
| Assessment              |     |       |    |       |
| Assessment              | 20  | 19.0% | 85 | 81.0% |
| Follow-up               | 11  | 10.5% | 94 | 89.5% |
| Probation               | 18  | 17.0% | 88 | 83.0% |
| Fees/Financial Aid      |     |       |    |       |
| Fees                    | 22  | 20.6% | 85 | 79.4% |
| Financial Aid           | 13  | 12.6% | 90 | 87.4% |
| Delivery                | 30  | 28.6% | 75 | 71.4% |
| Contract Education      | 16  | 15.5% | 87 | 84.5% |
| Off-Campus              | 27  | 25.2% | 80 | 74.8% |
| Other                   | 11  | 10.7% | 92 | 89.3% |

SOURCE: Chancellor's Office, July 1994.

Table 2

## LAST DATES TO ADD AND DROP COURSES

## LAST COURSE ADD DATE

| End of week: | Number of Colleges |
|--------------|--------------------|
| 1            | 11                 |
| 2            | 66                 |
| 3            | 14                 |
| 4            | 3                  |
| 5            | 1                  |
| Total        | 95                 |

## LAST COURSE DROP DATE

| End of week: | Number of Colleges | % of way through term | Number of Colleges | Total Number of Colleges |
|--------------|--------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| 5-9          | 5                  | 50%                   | 2                  | 7                        |
| 10-12        | 4                  | 66%                   | 11                 | 15                       |
| 13           | 4                  | 75%                   | 36                 | 40                       |
| 14           | 44                 | 80%                   | 0                  | 44                       |
| Total        | 57                 |                       | 49                 | 106                      |

SOURCE: Chancellor's Office, July 1994.

ranka.wk1

## ***APPENDIX F***

---

### **Fiscal and Programmatic Context for Enrollment Management Efforts**

# APPENDIX F

Table 1


## COMMUNITY COLLEGE ENROLLMENT AND FTES 1990-91 to 1993-94

| YEAR                      | ENROLLMENT | %CHG<br>FROM<br>PRIOR YEAR | FTES    | %CHG<br>FROM<br>PRIOR YEAR |
|---------------------------|------------|----------------------------|---------|----------------------------|
| <b>1990-91</b>            |            |                            |         |                            |
| Fall                      | 1,513,010  | 3.9%                       |         |                            |
| Annual                    |            |                            | 925,139 | 5.6%                       |
| Spring                    | 1,502,921  |                            | 0.61    |                            |
| <b>1991-92</b>            |            |                            |         |                            |
| Fall                      | 1,531,944  | 1.3%                       |         |                            |
| Annual                    |            |                            | 952,654 | 3.0%                       |
| Spring                    | 1,515,894  | 0.9%                       | 0.63    |                            |
| <b>1992-93</b>            |            |                            |         |                            |
| Fall                      | 1,521,277  | -0.7%                      |         |                            |
| Annual                    |            |                            | 926,854 | -2.7%                      |
| Spring                    | 1,420,391  | -6.3%                      | 0.63    |                            |
| <b>1993-94 (Estimate)</b> |            |                            |         |                            |
| Fall                      | 1,383,000  | -9.1%                      |         |                            |
| Annual                    |            |                            | 887,000 | -4.3%                      |
| Spring                    | 1,356,000  | -4.5%                      | 0.65    |                            |

SOURCE: Chancellor's Office, Research and Analysis Unit; 07-Jul-94.

## COMMUNITY COLLEGE ENROLLMENT AND FTES 1990-91 to 1993-94

TERM ENROLLMENT AND ANNUAL FTES  
(Millions)




ENR/FTES.

**Table 2**  
**COMMUNITY COLLEGE FTES ENROLLMENT AND DEMAND**

|       | DEMAND    |      | ENROLLED |       | UNSERVED<br>FTES | SERVED, BUT<br>UNFUNDED FTES |
|-------|-----------|------|----------|-------|------------------|------------------------------|
|       | FTES      | %CHG | FTES     | %CHG  |                  |                              |
| 88-89 | 836,790   | 5.1% | 836,790  |       | 0                | 6,544                        |
| 90    | 875,915   | 4.7% | 875,915  | 4.7%  | 0                | 42,441                       |
| 91    | 925,139   | 5.6% | 925,139  | 5.6%  | 0                | 57,807                       |
| 92    | 968,282   | 4.7% | 952,654  | 3.0%  | 15,628           | 75,084                       |
| 93    | 997,263   | 3.0% | 926,854  | -2.7% | 70,409           | 55,063                       |
| 93-94 | 999,068   | 0.2% | 887,000  | -4.3% | 112,068          | 40,462                       |
| 95    | 1,019,716 | 2.1% |          |       |                  |                              |
| 96    | 1,032,266 | 1.2% |          |       |                  |                              |
| 97    | 1,047,004 | 1.4% |          |       |                  |                              |
| 98    | 1,054,781 | 0.7% |          |       |                  |                              |
| 98-99 | 1,063,794 | 0.9% |          |       |                  |                              |

SOURCE: Chancellor's Office, 07/07/94.



NOTES: 1. FTES DEMAND is the enrollment that is estimated if CCCs had received their statutory COLA and growth beyond 1990-91 and if fees had not increased beyond their 1990-91 levels.

enrftes.wk1


**Table 3**  
**Trends in Students, Courses, Staff and Budgets**

| Year | FTES    | %chg  | Course<br>Sections<br>(average) | %chg  | FTE<br>Staff<br>(fall) | %chg  | GenFund<br>Expend<br>(in\$million) | %chg             | EndBal<br>(in\$million) | %chg   |
|------|---------|-------|---------------------------------|-------|------------------------|-------|------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|--------|
| 1982 | 851,936 |       |                                 |       | 44,717                 |       | \$1,771                            |                  | \$147                   |        |
| 1983 | 778,781 | -8.6% |                                 |       | 41,921                 | -6.3% | \$1,727                            | -2.5%            | \$159                   | 8.2%   |
| 1984 | 755,603 | -3.0% |                                 |       | 41,610                 | -0.7% | \$1,848                            | 7.0%             | \$128                   | -19.5% |
| 1985 | 748,071 | -1.0% |                                 |       | 42,132                 | 1.3%  | \$1,984                            | 7.4%             | \$167                   | 30.5%  |
| 1986 | 777,032 | 3.9%  |                                 |       | 42,541                 | 1.0%  | \$2,086                            | 5.1%             | \$180                   | 7.8%   |
| 1987 | 796,187 | 2.5%  |                                 |       | 43,000                 | 1.1%  | \$2,242                            | 7.5%             | \$210                   | 16.7%  |
| 1988 | 837,092 | 5.1%  |                                 |       | 43,556                 | 1.3%  | \$2,464                            | 9.9%             | \$257                   | 22.4%  |
| 1989 | 876,231 | 4.7%  |                                 |       | 45,846                 | 5.3%  | \$2,801                            | 13.7%            | \$272                   | 5.8%   |
| 1990 | 925,139 | 5.6%  | 148,464                         |       | 48,370                 | 5.5%  | \$3,047                            | 8.8%             | \$266                   | -2.2%  |
| 1991 | 952,654 | 3.0%  | 140,482                         | -5.4% | 48,161                 | -0.4% | \$3,011                            | -1.2%            | \$279                   | 4.9%   |
| 1992 | 926,854 | -2.7% | 138,498                         | -1.4% | 48,395                 | 0.5%  | \$3,063                            | 1.7%             | \$289                   | 3.6%   |
| 1993 | 887,000 | -4.3% | 132,689                         | -4.2% | 47,050                 | -2.8% | \$3,025                            | -1.2% (estimate) |                         |        |

NOTE: 1982: 1982-83 academic and fiscal year....

SOURCE: Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges, June 1994.

**CHANGES IN STUDENTS, STAFF, AND BUDGETS**  
**Calif. Community Colleges, 1982-1993**



course.wk1

Table 4  
COMMUNITY COLLEGE ENROLLMENT  
Fall 1970 to Fall 1993

FALL TERM HEADCOUNT ENROLLMENT  
(Millions)





Table 5

COMMUNITY COLLEGE ENROLLMENT CHANGE  
1970 to 1993

FALL TO FALL CHANGE IN HEADCOUNT  
(Thousands)



SOURCE: Chancellor's Office, July 1994.